Numerical Evidence for Approximate Consistency and Markovianity of some Quantum Histories in a Class of Finite Closed Spin Systems

Daniel Schmidtke[1,*] and Jochen Gemmer[1,†]

[1] *Fachbereich Physik, Universität Osnabrück, Barbarastrasse 7, D-49069 Osnabrück, Germany*

Closed quantum systems obey the Schrödinger equation whereas nonequilibrium behavior of many systems is routinely described in terms of classical, Markovian stochastic processes. Evidently, there are fundamental differences between those two types of behavior. We discuss the conditions under which the unitary dynamics may be mapped onto pertinent classical stochastic processes. This is first principally addressed based on the notions of "consistency" and "Markovianity." Numerical data are presented that show that the above conditions are to good approximation fulfilled for Heisenberg-type spin models comprising 12-20 spins. The accuracy to which these conditions are met increases with system size.

PACS numbers: 05.60.Gg, 72.80.Ng, 66.30.Ma,

arXiv:1602.08281v1 [quant-ph] 26 Feb 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

May quantum dynamics be mapped onto standard stochastic processes, especially in closed quantum systems? It is widely agreed that the general answer to this question is no (even though there have been investigations in this direction [1, 2]). Since the mid-2000s there has been increasing research activities in the field of "equilibration" and "thermalization" with respect to closed quantum systems, although the latter mechanisms are traditionally associated with stochastic processes. Most of these research activities have focused on the remarkable fact that after some, possibly very long, time [3–5], the behavior of many observables is very well be practically indistinguishable from standard phenomenological equilibrium behavior, despite the fact that the Schrödinger equation does not feature any attractive fixed point. Some of these attempts follow concepts of pure state quantum statistical mechanics [6, 7], typicality [8–10], or eigenstate thermalization hypothesis [9, 11]. However, according to textbook-level physics, a multitude of systems not only reach equilibrium after an extremely long time but also evolve towards it in a (quick) way that conforms with some master or Fokker-Planck equations. Moreover, there have recently been attempts to find and explain the emergence of Fokker-Planck-type dynamics in closed quantum systems [12–15]. Here we go a step further in that direction and investigate to what extent the quantum dynamics of certain observables in a specific system can be seen as being in accord not only with a Fokker-Planck equation, but also with the underlying stochastic process. The latter allows for producing individual stochastic trajectories.

The approach presented here is based on two central notions: "Markovianity" and "consistency".

Despite Markovianity already being a somewhat ambiguous term with differing definitions in the context of open quantum systems, cf. Refs. [16–18], we add below another definition which is furthermore applicable to closed quantum systems. The definition is based on mathematical constructions which have already been used by Wigner [19] to quantify probabilities for the occurrence of subsequent events. Our notion of consistency is the same as the one used in the context "consistent histories" which also deals with these mathematical constructions. Very loosely speaking, it quantifies the absence of coherence between different events. If the dynamics of some system with respect to some set of projectors is consistent, then the evolution of the expectation values of those projectors is independent of whether those projectors are repeatedly measured in time.

To avoid confusion it is important to note that (although measurements are mentioned) we neither address an open system scenario nor do we use open system analysis techniques [18]. This is to be contrasted with literature showing that in open systems, like the Caldeira-Leggett model, histories of, e.g., position measurements become consistent in the Markovian limit [20–22]. While the Caldeira-Leggett model is accessible by a Feynman-Vernon path integral approach that also allows for the formulation of consistency [20, 22], our models are not coupled to any baths, nor are their classical analogs integrable, thus rendering a path integral approach futile. A crucial point of our investigation is precisely the fact that consistency and Markovianity may occur even without any kind of "environment-induced superselection."

The present paper is organized as follows: in Secs. II and IV the "consistency concept" is reviewed and our notion Markovianity is specified. Furthermore, we use the general point of view that unitary dynamics may be mapped onto classical stochastic processes, if the unitary dynamics are consistent and Markovian, onto a more formal basis. We also argue qualitatively that typical Hamiltonians yield consistent and Markovian unitary dynamics for typical observables in Sec. III.

Section V contains our main result. It is a specific numerical example supporting the correctness of the qualitative

*Electronic address: danischm@uos.de

†Electronic address: jgemmer@uos.de

argument given in the previous Sec. III. We numerically investigate some generic sequences of transitions (or "quantum histories") in a generic spin system. We repeat the investigation for the same type of spin system but for sizes of 12-20 spins. This finite-size scaling suggests that the addressed quantum histories become indeed consistent and Markovian in the limit of large systems. Some comments on many-step Markovianity are given in Sec. VI where special attention is laid on comparison of sequences of identical events to random event sequences. Conclusions are drawn and possible further investigations are outlined in Sec. VII.

II. CONSISTENCY AND MARKOVIANITY CONDITIONS

Consistency is obviously a central concept in consistent history approaches [23], which is sometimes also called decoherent histories [20, 24]. In the context of the current paper we only need to introduce what is sometimes called the "decoherence functional" or "consistency condition" and its properties. The more philosophic aspects of the consistent history approach, concerning the interpretation of quantum mechanics are of no relevance here (for critical reviews see, e.g., Refs. [25, 26]). However, we will recapitulate the basic notions of the consistent history approach, in order to enable the reader unacquainted with the latter to develop a full understanding of the analysis within this paper.

Broadly speaking, one may describe quantum histories as a method to deal with the occurrence probabilities of certain event sequences. An event sequence consists of the alternating mathematical actions of measuring a certain property, encoded in some set of projection operators π_n, according to the von Neumann measurement scheme, and time-propagating the resulting state according to the Schroedigner equation. Note that the measured properties need not to be identical each time. The term "consistent" expresses the accordance of history probabilities with the Kolmogorov axioms, and the degree of accordance is quantified by the previously mentioned consistency condition, which is one of the central notions of the paper. With these preliminary remarks we embark on a somewhat more formal presentation of the consistent history approach.

To begin with, we introduce a complete set of projectors, i.e.,

$$\sum_i \pi_i \;=\; \mathbb{1} \quad , \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbb{1}$ denotes the unity operator and each projector corresponds to a possible event or measurement result. The set of projectors corresponds to some property.

We denote by $\rho(t)$ the density operator describing the system at time t and obtain the occurrence probability of event i at time point t as

$$P(x_i(t)) = \mathrm{tr}\{\pi_i \rho(t)\} \quad . \tag{2}$$

To shorten the following expressions, we define two abbreviations, i.e., (i) $\Pi_i\,\rho \;=\; \pi_i\,\rho\,\pi_i$ and (ii) $\mathcal{U}(\tau)\,\rho \;=\; U(\tau)\,\rho\,U(\tau)^\dagger$, where U denotes the time-translation operator which propagates the system states in amounts of τ.

A history is now created by performing a time translation after each measurement. To each of these histories one now assigns an occurrence probability, e.g. the event sequence $x_1(0) \to x_2(\tau_1) \to x_3(\tau_1+\tau_2)$ occurs with the probability

$$\begin{aligned} P(x_1(0), x_2(\tau_1), x_3(\tau_1+\tau_2); \rho) = \\ \mathrm{tr}\{\Pi_3\,\mathcal{U}(\tau_2)\,\Pi_1\,\mathcal{U}(\tau_1)\,\Pi_1\,\rho\} \; . \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

(This assignment was formally suggested in Ref. [19], i.e., before the consistent history concept was introduced.)

For simplicity, we will consider hereafter only equal time steps, i.e., $\tau = \tau_1 = \tau_2 = \cdots$, and therefore omit the time parameter.

A special situation in the context of consistent histories arises if the observation is not continuous, e.g., if one actually measures only in the beginning and the end and leaves the property at an intermediate time unmeasured. In this case (3) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} P(x_1, --, x_3; \rho) \;&=\; \mathrm{tr}\{\Pi_k\,\mathcal{U}^2\,\Pi_i\,\rho\} && (4)\\ &=\; \sum_{x_2} P(x_1, x_2, x_3; \rho) && (5)\\ &+\; \sum_{i\neq j} \mathrm{tr}\{\Pi_3\,\mathcal{U}(\,\pi_i(\,\mathcal{U}\,\Pi_1\,\rho)\,\pi_j)\} && (6) \end{aligned}$$

where $--$ indicates that at this intermediate time-point no measurement is performed.

The crucial expression here is Eq. (6), since this is the above mentioned decoherence functional. Only if the latter vanishes (which is called the consistency condition) does perfect accordance with the third Kolmogorov axiom (KA 3) result. Put another way: If some main event may be obtained as the result of many different, independent "subevents," then the probability for the main event to occur is given by the sum of the probabilities of the "subevents."

Since we will specifically calculate the value of decoherence functional numerically for some concrete examples, we rewrite the consistency condition here in an more explicit style,

$$\sum_{i\neq j} \mathrm{tr}\{\pi_3\,U\,\pi_i\,U\,\pi_1\,\rho\,\pi_1\,U^\dagger\,\pi_j\,U^\dagger\} \approx 0 \quad . \tag{7}$$

It is not to be expected that this expression ever vanishes precisely in a generic situation based on a finite quantum system, but it may possibly approach zero in the limit of infinitely large systems. It is this latter statement

which is one of the main targets of this paper. At this point we would like to emphasize some consequence of (7) for later reference: If (7) applies, then, by virtue of (1), summing the probability of some quantum history over all possible events at specific times produces the probability of a quantum history in which there are no measurements at the corresponding times, e.g.:

$$\sum_{x_1,x_2} P(x_1,x_2,x_3;\rho) = P(x_3;\rho) \tag{8}$$

Here we close our outline of basic concepts in consistent histories and refer the interested reader to the pertinent literature, e.g., Refs. [23, 27], and turn towards Markovianity.

In the context of (open) quantum dynamics the term "Markovian" has been used for a variety of features [18]. However, for the remainder of this work, "Markovianity" will be used to describe a property of quantum histories. The rationale behind this concept is that histories will be called Markovian, if a few past measurement outcomes suffice to fix the probabilities for the next future measurement outcomes. Our definition employs the notion of conditional probabilities as inferred from quantum histories. The construction of such conditional probabilities is straightforward, and we simply define them as the ratio of the occurrence probability of the event sequence $x_k \to \cdots \to x_{n+1}$ to that of $x_k \to \cdots \to x_n$, i.e.,

$$\omega(x_{n+1}|x_k,x_{k+1},\cdots,x_n;\rho) = \frac{P(x_k,\cdots,x_n,x_{n+1};\rho)}{P(x_k,\cdots,x_n;\rho)} \quad . \tag{9}$$

We call such a conditional probability one-step Markovian if

$$\omega(x_{n+1}|x_n;\rho) = \omega(x_{n+1}|x_k,\cdots,x_n;\rho) \tag{10}$$

holds true, two-step Markovian if only

$$\omega(x_{n+1}|x_{n-1},x_n;\rho) = \omega(x_{n+1}|x_k,\cdots,x_n;\rho) \tag{11}$$

holds, and so on. Obviously, conditional probabilities ω themselves as well as the validity of the above equations (10 and 11) depend on the initial state ρ. Below, in (21) we will focus on a specific class of initial states in order to get rid of this dependence.

III. QUALITATIVE CONSIDERATION ON THE TYPICALITY OF CONSISTENCY AND MARKOVIANITY

In the previous section consistency and Markovianity have been defined as properties of dynamics depending on both the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$ of the system and the observable that is actually being watched, the latter being formalized by the set of projectors $\{\hat{\pi}_i\}$. Having a feasible scheme which allows us to decide whether, for given $\hat{H}, \{\hat{\pi}_i\}$, consistency and Markovianity are present would be very instructive and generally most desirable. Unfortunately, such a scheme is yet unknown (however, we consider its development as an ambitious and promising line of future research). Thus we primarily resort to numerics and give in Sec. V a concrete example for a system and an observable which is consistent and Markovian.

Numerics, however, cannot answer the principal and important question if consistency and Markovianity may, in some sense, be generally expected. While we are far from being able to answer the question conclusively, we outline in the following a qualitative argument pointing in the direction of consistency and Markovianity being indeed natural for systems and observables featuring large Hilbert spaces and few symmetries. The argument is along the lines of the more general concept of "typicality" [8, 28, 29].

Consider an addend of the sum which serves to specify consistency (7). Denote the eigenstates of the projectors by π_i, π_j by $\{|n_i\rangle\}, \{|n_j\rangle\}$, respectively. Then a single addend for specific i, j reads

$$\sum_{n_i,n_j} \langle n_j|U^\dagger \pi_3\, U\,|n_i\rangle\langle n_i|\, U\,\pi_1\,\rho\,\pi_1\,U^\dagger\,|n_j\rangle \tag{12}$$

For $i \neq j$ the above sum (12) comprises products of two factors, both of which are complex numbers. The phases of those numbers are neither related to each other by any general principle nor restricted to a certain interval within the full range of $]0, 2\pi]$. Thus the terms in the sum may " average out" to zero. Indeed, if U's are drawn at random, (such that the mapping of any pure state onto any other pure state is equally probable, cf. e.g., Ref. [29]), then the averages over the individual factors vanish, as long as $\langle n_j|n_i\rangle = 0$ [30]. Furthermore, fluctuations around this average vanish as $\propto 1/d$, where d is the dimension of the respective Hilbert space [30]. Thus for the (overwhelming) majority of U's (12) is expected to result into a very small number, which then implies consistency. This is to be contrasted with the situation $i = j$. In this case both factors of the addends of (12) are real, positive numbers. Hence summing many of them will typically yield a considerably larger positive number.

A similar argument can be formulated which indicates that Markovianity is typical in the same sense. Consider the probability to get measurement outcome x_3 after x_1 and x_2 have occurred. According to (9) the corresponding conditional probability reads

$$\omega(x_3|x_1,x_2;\rho) = \frac{\sum_{n_2,m_2}\langle n_2|U^\dagger\pi_3\,U\,|m_2\rangle\langle m_2|\,U\,\pi_1\,\rho\,\pi_1\,U^\dagger\,|n_2\rangle}{\sum_{n_2}\langle n_2|\,U\,\pi_1\,\rho\,\pi_1\,U^\dagger\,|n_2\rangle} \tag{13}$$

where $|n_2\rangle, |m_2\rangle$ are eigenstates of π_2. If one, based on the same argument as given below (12), drops all terms that are not necessarily real and positive, this reduces to:

$$\omega(x_3|x_1,x_2;\rho) \approx \frac{\sum_{n_2}\langle n_2|U^\dagger\pi_3\,U\,|n_2\rangle\langle n_2|\,U\,\pi_1\,\rho\,\pi_1\,U^\dagger\,|n_2\rangle}{\sum_{n_2}\langle n_2|\,U\,\pi_1\,\rho\,\pi_1\,U^\dagger\,|n_2\rangle} \tag{14}$$

Again following the concepts of typicality one finds $\langle n_2|\, U\,\pi_1\,\rho\,\pi_1\,U^\dagger\,|n_2\rangle \;\approx\; 1/(\mathrm{tr}\{\pi_2\}\mathrm{tr}\{\pi_1\,\rho\,\pi_1\})$ for the overwhelming majority of all randomly distributed) U. Inserting this into (14) yields:

$$\omega(x_3|x_1,x_2;\rho) \;\approx\; \frac{\sum_{n_2}\langle n_2|U^\dagger\pi_3\,U\,|n_2\rangle}{\mathrm{tr}\{\pi_2\}} \tag{15}$$

$$=\; \omega(x_3|x_2;\pi_2) \tag{16}$$

Thus, for the majority of all U, neither the concrete initial state ρ nor the next-to-last observed value x_1 are relevant for the occurrence probability of x_3; it is only the very last observed value x_2 that matters. This is what has been defined as one-step Markovianity in (10). Hence, in this sense one-step Markovianity is typical.

It should be emphasized here, that all the above reasoning is based on "typical unitaries" U. While such a consideration is mathematically legitimate (and can be made rigorous [8, 10]), it does not imply that counterexamples do not exist. It does not even necessarily imply that counterexamples are rare in nature. Random U's are generated by Hamiltonians H that are essentially random, Hermitian matrices. However, most quantum many-particle models are characterized by Hamiltonians that differ significantly from random matrices: They are often sparse with respect to the site-occupation-number basis, they usually have only real entries, etc. Hence the considerations presented in the current section by no means replace the concrete numerical computations in Sect. V.

IV. FROM UNITARY DYNAMICS TO ONE-STEP STOCHASTIC PROCESSES

In this section, we establish that the dynamics of the above event probabilities, as following from the Schrödinger equation for non measured closed systems, may be rewritten as Markovian stochastic processes, provided that Eq. (7) and Eq. (10) hold. To this end we start by writing out the probability of some event x_{n+1} at the corresponding time in a seemingly complicated way, relying on (8):

$$P(x_{n+1}) = \sum_{x_1,\cdots,x_n} P(x_1,\cdots,x_n,x_{n+1};\rho) \tag{17}$$

This shall be rewritten in an even more complicated fashion as:

$$P(x_{n+1}) = \sum_{x_1,\cdots,x_n} \frac{P(x_1,\cdots,x_n,x_{n+1};\rho)}{P(x_1,\cdots,x_n;\rho)} P(x_1,\cdots,x_n;\rho). \tag{18}$$

However, if one-step Markovianity holds, i.e., if Eq. (10) applies, the above fraction may be replaced by the simpler one-step conditional probability,

$$P(x_{n+1}) = \sum_{x_n} \omega(x_{n+1}|x_n;\rho) \sum_{x_1,\cdots,x_{n-1}} P(x_1,\cdots,x_n;\rho). \tag{19}$$

Exploiting (8) again, this can be written as

$$P(x_{n+1}) = \sum_{x_n} \omega(x_{n+1}|x_n;\rho) P(x_n). \tag{20}$$

Except for the dependence of the transition probabilities ω on the very initial state, this equation is equivalent to a standard definition of a Markov chain on the sample space containing all x. For the remainder of this paper we specialize in certain initial states ρ of the form

$$\rho = \sum_i c_i \pi_i \quad c_i \geq 0 \quad . \tag{21}$$

The motivation for this choice is twofold. First, it may be viewed as a state in accord with Jayne's principle: If nothing is known about a quantum state except for the probabilities P_i of finding the outcome x_i, a state ρ of the form given in (21) with $c_i = P_i/\mathrm{tr}\{\pi_i\}$ maximizes the von Neumann entropy subject to the information given. Second, (16) suggests that a state ρ of the form of (21) produces transition probabilities in accord with the Markovian transition probabilities which are expected for typical unitaries U: It is simply a projector (in the specific example π_2) that takes the role of the initial state in (16).

From Eq. (9) it may also be inferred that for this class of initial states the transition probabilities ω are actually independent of the actual c_i, i.e., the transition probabilities ω are all the same for the entire class of initial states. Due to this, we omit, for brevity, ρ in the argument of ω, thus obtaining

$$P(x_{n+1}) = \sum_{x_n} \omega(x_{n+1}|x_n) P(x_n). \tag{22}$$

which defines a standard Markovian stochastic process.

To recapitulate the analysis so far, it can be stated that, if consistency and one-step Markovianity hold, it is straightforward to demonstrate that the unitary time propagation according to Schrödinger equation can also be expressed by a time-discrete stochastic process. Obviously the fact that we used one-step Markovianity is not necessary, i.e., also for more-step Markovianity stochastic processes may be formulated in an analogous way. However, since the models we investigate below appear to exhibit one-step Markovianity to sufficient accuracy, we will restrict ourselves to this case in the present section.

For convenience, at this point we do not (re-)define the features consistency and Markovianity directly but rather quantify their complements "nonconsistency" $\bar{C}$ and "non-Markovianity" $\bar{M}$. Both are below defined to be real numbers with $0 \leq \bar{C}(\bar{M})$ in such a way that 0 indicates perfect consistency (Markovianity) and any larger value expresses a (gradual) violation of the respective feature. The definition of nonconsistency reads:

$$\bar{C}(x_k,\cdots,--,\cdots,x_n) = \left| 1 - \frac{P(x_k,\cdots,--,\cdots,x_n)}{\sum_\gamma P(x_k,\cdots,x_n)} \right| \;, \tag{23}$$

where summation over all possible intermediate outcome sequences γ is denoted here as $\sum_\gamma$. In a similar fashion non-Markovianity is defined by:

$$\bar{M}(x_k,\cdots,x_n) = \left| 1 - \frac{\omega(x_{n+1}|x_{k-1},\cdots,x_n)}{\omega(x_{n+1}|x_k,\cdots,x_n)} \right| \quad , \quad (24)$$

It may be worth noting here that this is not the only possible sensible definition of non-Markovianity even within this framework. It obviously refers only to some specific conditional probability and takes only one prior measurement into account. In the remainder of this paper we will mainly focus on the exemplary investigation of some specific measurement outcome sequences, and return to more general questions in Sec. VI.

V. NUMERICAL INVESTIGATIONS



Figure 1: (Color online) Schematic visualization of a spin lattice consisting of two separable spin ladders. Each spin ladder has an assigned Hamiltonian h_L (h_R) where the spins are coupled by a strength J (solid lines). Both ladders are in turn coupled by a strength of order $J\,\beta$ (dashed lines).

The spin lattice that we are going to investigate basically consists of two spin ladders, with total number of spins $N = 4n$, which are brought into contact along opposing spines, cf. model in Fig. 1. Hence the Hamiltonian consists of three parts:

$$H = h_L \otimes h_R + V \quad , \quad (25)$$

where h_L (h_R) denotes the local Hamiltonian of the left (right) subsystem. V comprises the interaction between the subsystems. The left local Hamiltonian is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} h_L &= J\sum_{i=1}^{n} s_i^x s_{i+1}^x + s_i^y s_{i+1}^y + \Delta s_i^z s_{i+1}^z \\ &+ J\sum_{i=1}^{n} s_i^x s_{i+n}^x + s_i^y s_{i+n}^y + \Delta s_i^z s_{i+n}^z \\ &+ \text{h.c.} \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where the $s_{\cdots}^{\cdots}$ denote the pertinent operators of components of $s = 1/2$ spins sitting at the respective positions. The Hamiltonian of the right subsystem, h_R, is obtained through shifting the indices in (26) by $2n$, i.e., $s_i \to s_{i+2n}$. The overall energy scale is set by J.
The interaction of the both subsystems takes place only between the two "central" chains of the lattice, namely in this model between the second and third chain. Thus the interaction term reads

$$V = J\beta \sum_{i=n+1}^{2n} s_i^x s_{i+n}^x + s_i^y s_{i+n}^y + \Delta s_i^z s_{i+n}^z + \text{ h.c.} \quad (27)$$

The observable (or property) we are going to analyze in detail is the magnetization difference between both subsystems, i.e.,

$$X = \sum s_{i,L}^z - \sum s_{i,R}^z \quad , \quad (28)$$

where each sum represents the present total magnetization in the z direction within the left (right) spin ladder. Furthermore we restrict our analysis to the subspace of vanishing total magnetization, i.e., $\sum s_{i,L}^z + \sum s_{i,R}^z = 0$. Note that the latter is a constant of motion in this model. This subspace was essentially chosen since it is the largest one with respect to the dimension of the corresponding Hilbert space. Furthermore, we choose our event-operators corresponding to the property x concretely as the following projectors:

$$\pi_{x,E} = \pi_E\,\pi_x\,\pi_E \quad , \quad (29)$$

where π_x is the projector spanned by all eigenstates of X featuring the same eigenvalue x, i.e., $X = \sum_x x\pi_x$. The projector π_E restricts the dynamics to a more or less narrow region in energy space: It is spanned by all energy eigenstates of the uncoupled system, (i.e., without taking V into account) that feature eigenvalues with $E_i \in [-1.2J\,, +0.6J]$. To put this another way: The full energetic width of the system is on the order of the number of of spins, i.e., NJ. Moreover the chosen interval contains the highest densities of states with respect to energy.
Note that since $[\pi_E, \pi_x] = 0$ the $\pi_{x,E}$ are in fact orthogonal projectors. Obviously, the $\pi_{x,E}$ are not complete in the sense of (1). However, a formally complete set may always be introduced by adding the complement $\bar{\pi} = \mathbb{1} - \sum_x \pi_{x,E}$ to the $\pi_{x,E}$'s themselves. Practically, this hardly makes any difference since our numerics confirm that for our below choices of the model parameters almost no probability ever goes to $\bar{\pi}$, i.e., $P(\bar{\pi}, t) < 10^{-4}$.

Before we turn towards numerical results on consistency and Markovianity, we should point out that the whole setup, i.e., the Hamiltonian, the observable, the energy shell, etc., have been chosen in the specific way described above in order to find a nonrandom, finite system, in which consistency and Markovianity emerge already for rather small systems.
There are results in the literature that suggest to those

ends a set-up like the one defined above: In Refs. [12–15] Fokker-Planck-type dynamics have been reported for more or less similar spin systems. Furthermore, results in Ref. [31] indicate that the so-called eigenstate thermalization hypotheses (ETH) may be best fulfilled for bipartite systems in which the local subsystems are not merely spin chains. (Since the ETH guarantees a single, attractive, long-time probability distribution of the events its applicability is necessary for the emergence of effective stationary stochastic process dynamics.) For a first rough and of course non-sufficient check of whether the dynamics of our model may be in accord with a stochastic description, we compute the dynamics of the $P[x(t)]$, starting from $P(x=0)=1$ at $t=0$. The result is displayed in Fig. 2. The solid lines are obtained by solving simple transition-rate-based master equations. The agreement indicates that a fully stochastic description may be possible. Of course, since the model is finite, there will be (quasi-) recurrences. However, these are expected at times that are by magnitudes larger than any timescale considered here and thus excluded from our analysis. We fix the principal time scale of interest by means of Fig. 2. Although the true dynamics are strictly unitary, the $P[x(t)]$ appear to relax to towards constant values. Thus we call the the time scale at which this relaxation happens the "relaxation time" τ_R. Specifically, we infer $\tau_R = 20J$.



Figure 2: (Color online) Displayed are the dynamics of $P[x(t)]$ starting from $P(x=0)=1$ at $t=0$ for all occurring values of x within a system of size $N=12$, i.e., $x \in \{0, \pm 2, \pm 4, \pm 6\}$. These dynamics are compared to results from simple transition-rate-based master equations (solid lines). Agreement indicates that a fully stochastic description may be possible.

We now investigate nonconsistency and non-Markovianity as defined by (23) and (24), in more detail. As already pointed out before (29), nonconsistency and non-Markovianity here refer to sequences of transitions between certain magnetization differences. More precisely: the projectors which enter the definition of $\bar{C}, \bar{M}$ through (3) are the projectors $\pi_{x,E}$ as appearing in (29). Hence, below x continues to indicate the magnetization difference. To begin with we kept the number of spins fixed at $N=12$ and calculated $\bar{C}, \bar{M}$ as functions of τ (the time elapsed between measurements) for various coupling strengths β. The paths chosen for this example are $x = 2 \to -- \to 0$ (nonconsistency) and $x = 2 \to 0 \to 0$ (non-Markovianity). The results are displayed in Fig. 3.



Figure 3: (Color online) Specific non-consistencies (a) and (one-step) non-Markovianities (b) are displayed for three different interaction strengths, depending on the "waiting time" τ between measurements. The latter are given in units of the respective relaxation time τ_R. The system size is fix at $N=12$. For waiting times τ larger than, say, $\tau_R/10$ both nonconsistency and non-Markovianity, remain, while fluctuating, low compared to unity at all interaction strengths. For our further exemplary investigations we thus choose $\beta = 0.5$ and $\tau = 0.5\tau_R$.

Though the graphs exhibit rather large values for small portions of relaxation time, they decrease significantly at times on the order of a tenth of the total relaxation time, i.e., $\tau \approx 0.1\,\tau_R$. Qualitatively, this behavior is the same for all investigated interaction strengths. This indicates that there is a lower limit on the time step τ, below which neither consistency nor Markovianity may be expected. This limit may, however, depending on the size and the structure of the system, only be a small fraction of the to-

tal relaxation time. Precisely finding the minimum time step which allows for consistency and Markovianity is left for further research. In the this paper we focus on a relatively large time step, i.e., $\tau = 0.5\tau_R$, and primarily investigate the effect of increasing system sizes. Furthermore, we restrict our further analysis to interaction strength $\beta = 0.5$. The result (which is our main numerical result) is displayed in Fig. 4. It shows nonconsistency and non-Markovianity for various system sizes N. Up to $N = 16$ the results have been computed by means of direct numerical diagonalization. Due to limitations in computing power, we computed the result for $N = 20$ using a numerical method based on dynamical typicality. This method has been used and described e.g., in Refs. [32–34]. Based on this method we are able to address $N = 20$ within reasonable computing time; however, the method involves random numbers and is thus subject to statistical errors. The magnitude of the latter is indicated by the corresponding error bars. Obviously nonconsistency and non-Markovianity are already small for moderate system sizes. Furthermore, both decrease monotonically with increasing system sizes. Figure 4 suggests that the dynamics become consistent and one-step Markovian in the limit of infinitely large systems. Whether this is indeed the case is not to be answered conclusively from our finite-size scaling. It is possible to perform the same numerical calculations for system sizes up to, say, $N = 36$ [34], but this requires high performance computing clusters. The present analysis, however, has been done using standard desktop computing equipment.



Figure 4: (Color online) Specific non-consistencies (a) and (one-step) non-Markovianities (b) are displayed for increasing system sizes N. Obviously both decrease with increasing system size. Although the data are not conclusive, it suggests that both may vanish in the limit of $N \to \infty$.

VI. "MORE-THAN-ONE"-STEP MARKOVIANITY

So far we primarily focused on one-step Markovianity throughout this paper. Furthermore, the numerical analysis in the previous section was based on a specific definition of one-step Markovianity (24) that takes only one prior outcome into account. Such an analysis is necessarily insufficient for the rigorous mapping of unitary dynamics onto a stochastic process. This may be seen most easily from considering two aspects: (i) If a stochastic process is not fully Markovian with respect to one-step Markovianity, it may nevertheless be possibly fully Markovian with respect to, e.g., two-step Markovianity. Thus some finite one-step non-Markovianity does not rule out a process from being Markovian altogether. (ii) Even if it is found that the conditional probability to get some event at time $(n+1)\tau$ does not change much if one takes the measurement outcome not only at time $n\tau$ but also at time $(n-1)\tau$ into account, this does not *a priori* mean that the conditional probability does not change much if, e.g., the outcome at time $(n-2)\tau$ is additionally taken into account. However, as explained below (24) only the former feature is captured by the definition of non-Markovianity and numerically analyzed in Sec. V. We emphasize again that the concept of "repeated measurements" employed here does not evolve any outside measurement apparatus or any external environment. It exclusively refers to histories as formulated in (3) and is thus well defined also for closed systems. Hence, the present consideration is not to be confounded with the Zeno effect where quickly repeated external measurements "freeze" the dynamics [35]. While being always well defined our concept primarily addresses repeated measurements with time steps larger than the time at which consistency vanishes in the short time limit, cf. Fig. 3.

A full-fledged numerical analysis taking all possible histories and all above aspects of many-step-Markovianity exhaustively into account is beyond our possibilities, given the limit of reasonable computing time. However, in the following we focus on the many-step Markovianity of some special histories.

The first history we address is the one that is generated by getting, upon repeated measuring, always the same outcome. A history like this may be relevant in situations in which some measurement outcome corresponds to the equilibrium state of the system. As will be explained below, it turns out that such a history is necessarily λ-

step Markovian, in the limit of large λ, irrespective of the concretely considered system.

Considering the occurrence probabilities for this type of history with initial states of the class introduced in (21) yields $P(x_i(0), x_i(\tau), \cdots, x_i(\lambda\tau)) := \mathrm{tr}\{\pi_i U \pi_i U \cdots U^\dagger \pi_i U^\dagger \pi_i\}$, where x_i characterizes the measured property and the second index λ labels the number of performed measurements. For brevity the index i will be omitted hereafter. Let us denote the eigensystem of the (non-Hermitian) matrix $U^\dagger\pi$ by $U^\dagger\pi|\varphi_n >= \phi_n|\varphi_n >$, and the occurrence probability of λ identical measurements by $P(\{x\}_\lambda)$. Then this occurrence-probability is given by

$$P(\{x\}_\lambda) = \sum_{ijk} c^*_{ik} c_{jk} \{\phi^*_i\}^\lambda \{\phi_j\}^\lambda \quad , \tag{30}$$

where the c_{ij} denote the complex matrix element of the transformation that maps the nonorthogonal eigenvectors $|\varphi_n >$ onto an orthonormal basis, i.e., $\sum_{ij} < \varphi_i|\varphi_j > c^*_{ik} c_{jl} = \delta_{kl}$.

All eigenvalues of $U^\dagger\pi$ are upper bounded by 1, hence $|\phi_i| \leq 1$ holds, and thus $\{\phi_i^\lambda\}$ describes a convex sequence with respect to λ. Consequently, $P(\{x\}_\lambda)$, consisting only of sums of convex functions, is also convex. Convexity implies

$$\frac{P(\{x\}_{\lambda+1})}{P(\{x\}_\lambda)} \leq \frac{P(\{x\}_{\lambda+2})}{P(\{x\}_{\lambda+1})} \; \forall \; \lambda \tag{31}$$

hence ω_λ, defined as

$$\omega_\lambda = \frac{P(\{x\}_{\lambda+1})}{P(\{x\}_\lambda)} \tag{32}$$

is a monotonously increasing sequence. From the definition of the history probability we immediately find $P(\{x\}_{\lambda+1}) \leq P(\{x\}_\lambda) \;\; \forall\lambda$. Thus ω_λ is upper bounded by one. Since ω_λ is monotonously increasing but upper bounded it must converge against some finite value $d \leq 1$:

$$\lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \omega_\lambda = d \; \in \; \mathbb{R}^+. \tag{33}$$

Plugging this result into the definition of non-Markovianity (24) yields

$$\lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \bar{M}_\lambda = \left| 1 - \lim_{\lambda\to\infty} \frac{\omega_{\lambda+1}}{\omega_\lambda} \right| = \left| 1 - \frac{d}{d} \right| \equiv 0 \quad . \tag{34}$$

Hence, in case of repeatedly measuring some property and consequently obtaining identical events as measurement outcomes, perfect Markovianity always results for sufficiently many steps. Although the implications of this result are limited (it only applies to a single type of history and takes consistency for granted) we consider it a valuable point of reference.

The data displayed in Fig. 5 address λ-step non-Markovianity for both histories of the previously discussed type featuring identical outcomes, $x = 0$, in Fig. 5(a) and for some random event sequences of the typical type which would occur if one simply took $\omega(x_{n+1}|x_n)$ as a fully one-step Markovian transition probability in Fig. 5(b). Since jump probabilities away from $x = 0$ are low but towards $x = 0$ are high, the latter typical random sequences are, similarly to the former, characterized by measuring $x = 0$ most of the times, but exhibit occasional "excursions" towards $x \neq 0$. We display data for $N = 12$ and various τ in Fig. 5(a) and $\tau = 0.26\tau_R$ in (b).



Figure 5: (Color online) Non-Markovianity for sequences comprising λ measurements which yield all $x = 0$ (a) or generated from drawing random numbers according to the one-step transition probabilities ω (b). Data in (a) confirm that λ-step transition probabilities always become perfectly Markovian in the limit of $\lambda \to \infty$ as claimed in the text. This result is independent of the waiting time τ. Data in (b) suggest that λ-step transition probabilities may become perfectly Markovian in the limit of $\lambda \to \infty$ also in the case of "generic stochastic trajectories." However, at the first deviation of the measurement sequence from a uniform sequence, somewhat larger non-Markovianities occur; for more comments see text.

The graphs in (a) are obviously in accord with (34): Regardless of the "waiting-time" τ, histories become Markovian in the limit of large λ. Furthermore, non-Markovianity is not strictly monotonously decreasing with λ, but in the addressed data sample $\bar{M}_{\lambda>1} < \bar{M}_{\lambda=1}$ appears to be strictly obeyed. Furthermore sequences appear to be more Markovian for shorter waiting times. Altogether one may conclude that for the uniform histories

Markovianity appears to improve if more steps are taken into account but a restriction to the "one-step-level" may nevertheless be a very reasonable approximation.

Considering the random histories in (b) it should first be noted that, while $\bar{M}_{\lambda>1} < \bar{M}_{\lambda=1}$ no longer strictly holds, non-Markovianities nevertheless remain very moderate also on the many-step level. Thus, also in these cases a restriction to the one-step level appears to be a very reasonable approximation. However, the peaks towards relatively higher non-Markovianities always occur at the most recent deviation from measuring identical outcomes. For example, in the history represented by the magenta circles, the first (past) 16 outcomes are $x = 0$, but the 17'th outcome is $x = 2$. Nevertheless, in all our examples, while Markovianity becomes worse for this most recent deviation, it becomes better again with taking even longer histories into account. Thus, considering Fig. 5(b) one may guess that a statement like (34) also holds for arbitrary histories, and whether or not this holds true remains a subject of future research.

VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The possibility of describing the unitary dynamics as generated by the Schrödinger equation quantitatively in terms of pertinent stochastic processes is addressed. We discuss this possibility based on the notions of "consistency" and "Markovianity." While the former refers to the concept of consistent histories, the latter denotes the independence of probabilities for future measurement outcomes from measurement outcomes in the distant past. We outline how a mapping mapping of quantum onto stochastic dynamics can be performed if, indeed, the quantum dynamics is both consistent and Markovian. This obviously leads directly to the question whether closed system dynamics are approximately Markovian and consistent for specific, finite closed systems. This question is exemplarily discussed in the remainder of the paper. The degree to which the quantum dynamics are indeed consistent and Markovian is specified by introducing corresponding quantifiers. These quantifiers are numerically evaluated for a specific type of spin system. By means of finite-size scaling we give (strong) evidence that the dynamics of this closed spin system can indeed be considered consistent and Markovian. A somewhat more detailed analysis shows that one may rely on a description based on stochastic processes that take only the most recent past event into account. While an exhaustive numerical check of "consistency" and "Markovianity," covering all aspects of "stochasticity," is far beyond of what can be done in finite computing time, our results indicate that a dynamical stochastic description of closed quantum systems may be justified, even for rather small systems.

VIII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

J. Gemmer acknowledges valuable input received at meetings of the European network COST Action MP1209 "Thermodynamics in the Quantum Regime".

[1] E. Nelson, Phys. Rev. **150**, 1079 (1966).
[2] W. J. Lehr and J. L. Park, J. Math. Phys. **18**, 1235 (1977).
[3] A. S. L. Malabarba, L. P. Garcia-Pintos, N. Linden, T. C. Farrelly, and A. J. Short, Phys. Rev. E **90**, 012121 (2014).
[4] F. G. S. L. Brandao, P. Cwiklinski, M. Horodecki, P.Horodecki, J. K. Korbicz, and M. Mozrzymas, Phys. Rev. E **86**, 031101 (2012).
[5] S. Goldstein, T. Hara, and H. Tasaki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 140401 (2013).
[6] A. Bendersky, F. Pastawski, and J. P. Paz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 190403 (2008).
[7] N. Linden, S. Popescu, A. J. Short, and A. Winter, Phys. Rev. E **79**, 061103 (2009).
[8] S. Goldstein, J. L. Lebowitz, R. Tumulka, and N. Zanghi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 050403 (2006).
[9] S. Goldstein, J. L. Lebowitz, R. Tumulka, and N. Zanghi, Eur. Phys. Jour. H **35**, 173 (2010).
[10] P. Reimann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 160404 (2007).
[11] M. Rigol, V. Dunjko, and M. Olshanii, Nature **452**, 854 (2008).
[12] H. Niemeyer, D. Schmidtke, and J. Gemmer, Europhysics Letters **101**, 1 (2013).
[13] C. Ates, J. P. Garrahan, and I. Lesanovsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 110603 (2012).
[14] S. Ji, C. Ates, J. P. Garrahan, and I. Lesanovsky, J. Stat. Mech. p. P02005 (2013).
[15] I. Tikhonenkov, A. Vardi, J. R. Anglin, and D. Cohen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 050401 (2013).
[16] Ángel Rivas, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio, Reports on Progress in Physics **77**, 094001 (2014).
[17] B. Vacchini, A. Smirne, E.-M. Laine, J. Piilo, and H.-P. Breuer, New Journal of Physics **13**, 093004 (2011).
[18] H. P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, 2010).
[19] E. P. Wigner, Am. J. Phys. **31**, 6 (1963).
[20] M. Gell-Mann and J. J. B. Hartle, *Complexity, Entropy and the Physics of Information* (Addison-Wesley, 1990).
[21] J. P. Paz and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 2728 (1993).
[22] H. F. Dowker and J. J. Halliwell, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 1580 (1992).
[23] R. B. Grifiths, J. Stat. Phys. **36**, 219 (1984).
[24] J. J. Halliwell, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 124032 (2009).
[25] A. E. Allahverdyan, R. Balian, and T. M. Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Rep. (2013).
[26] E. Okon and D. Sudarsky, Found. Phys. **44**, 19 (2014).
[27] R. Omnès, Phys. Lett. A **125**, 169 (1987).
[28] J. Cho and M. S. Kim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 170402 (2010).
[29] S. Goldstein, J. L. Lebowitz, C. Mastrodonato, R. Tu-

mulka, and N. Zanghi, Phys. Rev. E **81**, 011109 (2010).
[30] J. Gemmer, M. Michel, and G. Mahler, *Quantum Thermodynamics: Emergence of Thermodynamic Behavior Within Composite Quantum Systems* (Springer, 2009), 2nd ed.
[31] R. Steinigeweg, A. Khodja, H. Niemeyer, C. Gogolin, and J. Gemmer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 130403 (2014).
[32] R. Steinigeweg, F. Heidrich-Meisner, J. Gemmer, K. Michielsen, and H. DeRaedt, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 094417 (2014).
[33] C. Bartsch and J. Gemmer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 110403 (2009).
[34] H. Niemeyer, K. Michielsen, H. DeRaedt, and J. Gemmer, Phys.Rev. E **89**, 012131 (2014).
[35] E. Joos, H. D. Zeh, C. Kiefer, D. Giulini, J. Kupsch, and I.-O. Stamatescu, *Decoherence and the Appearance of a Classical World in Quantum Theory* (Springer, 2002), 2nd ed.